DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 035 001 CG 004 264

AUTHOR	Perrone, Philip A.
TITLE	Predicting Job Entry, Job Satisfaction, and Job Performance of Graduates from Wisconsin Secondary School Vocational Programs.
INSTITUTION	Wisconsin Univ., Madison.
SPONS AGENCY	Wisconsin State Dept. of Public Instruction, Madison.; Wisconsin Univ., Madison. Center for Studies in Vocational and Technical Education.
PUB DATE	[69]
NOTE	47p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.45
DESCRIPTORS	*Achievement, *Followup Studies, *High School Students, *Job Satisfaction, Job Skills, Occupational Choice, Persistence, Vocational Aptitude, *Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

This report is concerned with the role of the secondary schools in implementing vocational direction. It contains a two-year follow up which sought self reports of on-the-job satisfaction and evaluations by immediate job supervisors. Thirty pilot programs in high school vocational education were started in 1964-65; 444 graduates of these programs responded to the inquiry. The results showed the following variables distinguishing boys and girls who entered work directly: (1) living in either a rural or metropolitan area; (2) wanting to remain near home; (3) having fathers with an elementary school education; and (4) having poor mathematics and science achievement. Boys who entered work were also rated poor by their teachers in personal appearance, industriousness, and getting along with others. Girls entering work directly were likely to identify with their mothers or a female relative. Job satisfaction and job performance tended to be inversely related, particularly for girls. Complete data tables are included. (Author/KJ)

ED035001

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

PREDICTING JOB ENTRY, JOB SATISFACTION, AND JOB PERFORMANCE OF GRADUATES FROM WISCONSIN SECONDARY SCHOOL VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Philip A. Perrone
The University of Wisconsin

The study of occupations and occupational choices has become increasingly important since World War II. From the psychological point of view the individual's vocational development is important because it is seen involving conflict due to the clash between what man wants and what he can obtain. From the economical and sociological points of view, understanding occupation and occupational choice is important because of the need for some control of work and the worker in this complex society.

The public high school system is recognized as making an important contribution in helping individuals make appropriate vocational choices both in terms of the individual's needs and the needs of society. Because the high school is the gathering place for the majority of young people who must make occupational choices, it seems appropriate that the Vocational Education Act of 1963 centers much of its concern on the role high schools play in helping students prepare themselves vocationally. The Act calls for evaluation of

> pilot programs...designed to meet the special vocational education needs of youth, particularly youth in economically depressed communities who have academic, socioeconomic handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in the regular vocational programs.

This report is concerned with the role of the secondary schools in implementing vocational direction. It contains a two-year follow up which sought self reports of on-the-job satisfaction and evaluations by immediate

---

This study was made possible through the financial assistance of the Center for Studies in Vocational and Technical Education at the University of Wisconsin and the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction.

CG001264

job supervisors. Because a portion of the original sample entered work directly and a considerable number chose to continue their education or training, it was also decided to see what would differentially characterize these two groups. Because work has different meanings for men and women, this report is separate for males and females.

Background

In response to the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction initiated thirty pilot programs in vocational education at the high school level in 1964-65. The schools were chosen so they would be of different sizes; two had enrollments of more than 3,000 while one had an enrollment of under 200. Schools from different geographic regions of the state, and from communities ranging from a city the size of Milwaukee to a small rural town were included. More specifically, four groups of communities based on size were represented: major metropolitan areas with populations of 80,000 or more; minor metropolitan areas--populations between 30,000 and 80,000; small cities in a basically rural area--populations between 5,000 and 30,000; and small rural communities--population under 5,000.

Sample

Four hundred and forty-four graduates from a target sample of 550 responded to the five follow up efforts. All the respondents were 1966 graduates of Wisconsin high schools and all had participated in a vocational education program. Those included in this sample graduated from 28 high schools in 21 communities. There were 160 male respondents of whom 73 reported they were working, 62 had continued their education, and 25 were in the military. There were 284 female respondents of whom 200 reported

they were working and 84 had continued their education. The number of workers is reduced because for some, essential high school data were missing. Some workers did not give permission to contact their job supervisors so it was not possible to compare their psycho-social-academic measures taken in high school with the ratings of their job supervisor. Lastly, some job supervisors were slow to respond and after two follow up letters were sent, no further attempt to elicit a response was made in order to avoid irritating the supervisor which might cause difficulty for the worker.

In studying factors related to job satisfaction as determined by student self report, the analysis is made for 45 males and 142 females.

The sample used in this study was drawn originally by having vocational classroom teachers identify the best and the poorest (the top and bottom 25%) of the seniors in their classes, using as a criterion projected on-the-job performance. Due to the sampling procedure and the discrete nature of most of the predictor variables and the two sets of criteria variables, the non-parametric statistic, Chi Square, was used in analyzing the significance of the relationships studied.

In addition to the community size and teacher projections of future on-the-job performance, the following predictor variables (available in the graduate's senior year) were used in this study. The distribution of scores for males and females entering work and continuing their training are presented in Table A following a description of the variables.

1. Teacher ratings of each student on a five-point Likert scale ranging from Poor to Superior for each of these dimensions: (See Appendix A)

   Dependability
   Cultural Refinement
   Leadership
   Industriousness
   Mental Alertness
   Thoroughness
   Personal Appearance
   Ability to Get Along with Others
   Social Habits

2. Pupil self-ratings on the same scale over the same nine characteristics plus the additional one of:

   Employability

3. A statement regarding post-high school training plans which included:

   No Plans
   Technical Training
   Apprenticeship Training
   College

4. A statement regarding post-high school plans in general which included:

   More School
   Work
   Apprenticeship
   Military
   Undecided

5. Distance from home they would be willing to go for a job, categorized as:

   Less than 25 miles
   Up to 100 miles
   Anywhere in the Midwest
   Anyplace

6. The amount they wanted to make per week, dichotomized as:

   Between $75 and $149
   More than $150

7. Their relationship to the adult worker they would most like to emulate, categorized as:

   Parent
   Other Relative
   Person in a Work Setting
   Friend

8. What they wanted most from a job, which included a job:

   Where you would be looked upon very highly by others
   Where you could be boss
   No danger of being fired
   Where you could use your talents or skills
   A highly-paid job
   Where you could work with your friends
   Where you could work more or less on your own

9. Which of these five would give them greatest satisfaction:

   Work
   Family
   Hobbies and Sports
   Religion
   Community Activities

10. Their father's educational level:

    Grade School
    High School Graduate
    Technical School
    College Graduate

11. Their father's occupational level, using Roe's categories:

    Professional and Managerial: Independent Responsibility
    Professional and Managerial II
    Semi-professional and Small Business
    Skilled
    Semi-skilled
    Unskilled

12. Their reading, social studies, mathematics, science, and writing sub-test scores on either the Iowa Tests of Educational Development (ITED) or the Sequential Tests of Educational Progress (STEP) placing percentile scores into five groups:

    0-19
    20-39
    40-59
    60-79
    80-99

13. Cumulative high school grade-point averages in English, social studies, science, mathematics, business and industrial arts divided into three categories:

    A to B-
    C+ to C-
    D and F

TABLE A

Percentage of Workers and Students in the Various Categories on the Predictor Variables

Predictor Variables	Males		Females	
	Workers (N = 73)	Students (N = 62)	Workers (N = 186)	Students (N = 84)
Community Size				
Major metropolitan	37	18	20	8
Minor metropolitan	25	39	41	45
Small city	3	21	13	18
Small rural	36	23	25	29
Quartile Rating				
Upper	48	63	62	57
Lower	52	37	38	43
Teacher Ratings on:				
Dependability				
Below Average	21	19	17	21
Average	30	27	22	19
Above Average	49	53	60	60
Cultural Refinement				
Below Average	15	10	9	8
Average	85	90	91	92
Leadership				
Below Average	37	27	24	26
Average	32	34	36	35
Above Average	32	39	39	39
Industriousness				
Below Average	36	21	19	25
Average	22	34	20	20
Above Average	42	45	61	55
Mental Alertness				
Below Average	30	24	19	21
Average	29	25	23	22
Above Average	41	51	58	56
Thoroughness				
Below Average	32	24	21	27
Average	36	31	20	19
Above Average	32	45	59	54
Personal Appearance				
Below Average	11	2	10	4
Average	49	39	27	22
Above Average	40	59	63	74

TABLE A (continued)

Predictor Variables	Males Workers (N = 73)	Males Students (N = 62)	Females Workers (N = 186)	Females Students (N = 84)
Getting Along with Others				
Below Average	14	5	11	8
Average	45	35	30	28
Above Average	41	60	59	64
Social Habits				
Below Average	23	15	9	12
Average	33	31	22	21
Above Average	44	55	68	66
Student Self Ratings on:				
Dependability				
Below Average	3	0	1	0
Average	45	48	38	33
Above Average	52	52	61	67
Cultural Refinement				
Below Average	2	2	1	0
Average	49	48	45	36
Above Average	49	48	54	64
Leadership				
Below Average	22	26	21	21
Average	51	44	53	55
Above Average	27	30	26	24
Industriousness				
Below Average	8	15	8	13
Average	60	51	44	52
Above Average	31	34	48	35
Mental Alertness				
Below Average	10	8	2	5
Average	44	39	44	43
Above Average	46	53	54	52
Thoroughness				
Below Average	10	15	9	6
Average	53	50	48	49
Above Average	37	35	43	45
Personal Appearance				
Below Average	4	6	1	0
Average	48	47	45	42
Above Average	48	47	54	58
Getting Along with Others				
Below Average	4	5	1	1
Average	44	40	34	28
Above Average	52	55	65	71

TABLE A (continued)

Predictor Variables	Males Workers (N = 73)	Males Students (N = 62)	Females Workers (N = 186)	Females Students (N = 84)
Social Habits				
Below Average	12	16	8	5
Average	66	48	60	59
Above Average	22	36	32	36
Employability				
Below Average	1	2	2	3
Average	25	26	33	32
Above Average	74	74	65	65
Post High School Training Plans				
No Plans	34	0	57	0
Technical Training	38	49	38	60
Apprenticeship	20	0	1	0
College	8	51	4	40
General Post High School Plans				
More School	18	100	14	100
Work	57	0	80	0
Apprenticeship	13	0	0	0
Military	10	0	0	0
Undecided	2	0	6	0
Distance from Home They Would Go for Work				
Up to 25 miles	43	16	53	27
Up to 100 miles	13	12	8	14
In the Midwest	5	9	6	8
Any place in the world	40	63	33	51
Salary Aspiration				
Under $75	1	1	18	13
$75 - $149	50	38	79	68
$150 and over	49	61	3	19

TABLE A (continued)

Predictor Variables	Males		Females	
	Workers (N = 73)	Students (N = 62)	Workers (N = 186)	Students (N = 84)
Adult Worker They Would Most Like to Resemble				
Parent	15	15	4	10
Relative	24	26	44	21
Acquaintance	28	41	26	35
Friend	33	18	26	34
Work Value Orientation				
Esteem by others	5	5	8	9
Leadership	3	2	1	1
Security	8	0	3	3
Use your talents	47	60	66	66
High pay	5	13	5	8
Work with friends	8	10	7	2
Independence	23	11	10	10
Life Satisfactions from				
Work	18	31	20	18
Family	56	35	64	65
Hobbies	23	26	8	7
Religion	1	5	8	9
Community	0	3	0	1
Fathers' Educational Level				
Grade school	59	45	50	38
High school graduate	35	35	46	50
Technical school	3	11	4	8
College graduate	3	9	0	4
Fathers' Occupational Level				
Professional I				
Professional II	29	27	23	23
Semi-professional	32	34	23	26
Skilled	20	23	23	23
Semi-skilled	7	4	14	13
Unskilled	12	12	17	15

TABLE A (continued)

Predictor Variables	Males Workers (N = 73)	Males Students (N = 62)	Females Workers (N = 186)	Females Students (N = 84)
Achievement Test Scores				
Reading percentiles				
0 - 39%	60	50	29	24
40 - 79%	29	34	43	43
80% and above	11	16	28	33
Social studies percentiles				
0 - 39%	77	63	48	35
40 - 79%	18	18	32	41
80% and above	5	19	20	29
Mathematics percentiles				
0 - 39%	45	24	44	34
40 - 79%	40	29	43	36
80% and above	15	47	13	30
Science percentiles				
0 - 39%	49	23	40	39
40 - 79%	33	42	47	36
80% and above	18	35	13	25
Writing percentiles				
0 - 39%	89	71	58	42
40 - 79%	11	21	25	24
80% and above	0	8	17	24
Cumulative Grades				
English				
A to B-	16	18	56	60
C+ to C-	47	57	36	37
D and F	37	25	8	3
Social studies				
A to B-				1
C+ to C-	38	44	38	46
D and F	62	56	62	53
Science				
A to B-	7	29	37	32
C+ to C-	53	52	50	48
D and F	40	19	13	10
Mathematics				
A to B-	16	24	36	36
C+ to C-	44	54	40	46
D and F	40	22	24	18
Business	(N = 28)	(N = 21)		
A to B-	18	43	63	61
C+ to C-	50	43	29	37
D and F	32	14	8	2
Industrial Arts	(N = 56)	(N = 51)		
A to B-	46	53		
C+ to C-	45	44		
D and F	9	4		

The criteria variables were measures of job satisfaction and job performance. The job satisfaction measure was developed from the Cornell Studies of Job Satisfaction[1] in which job satisfaction was formulated to reflect the predominate theme in most formulations which the investigators described as:

> " . . . a feeling associated with a perceived difference between what is expected as a fair and reasonable return and what is experienced, in relation to the alternatives available in a given situation."

Satisfaction can be described as unique to the individual's perception and involves the distance between what he has and what he thinks he should have.

Locke[2] and his associates at Cornell formulated a five-factor inventory of job satisfaction which is used in this study. The factors are: present pay, opportunities for promotion, the work itself, the supervisor, and the people one works with. The instrument (see Appendix B) used to assess these five factors asks the respondent to indicate whether or not a particular aspect describes his job. There are eighteen aspects included under work, supervision, and co-workers and nine aspects under pay and promotion.

The worker was asked to provide the name of his or her immediate job supervisor and permission was sought for the investigator to contact the supervisor. If permission was granted, the supervisor was sent a two-page rating scale with a brief statement describing the purpose of the study. There were eighteen specific traits and an overall rating which the supervisor was to provide (see Appendix C). A five-point Likert scale

---

1 Smith, Patricia C. Cornell Studies of Job Satisfaction: I. Strategy for the Development of a General Theory of Job Satisfaction. Cornell University, 1963. (mimeo)

2 Locke, Edwin A., Smith, Patricia C., Hulen, Charles L., and Kendall, Lorne M. Cornell Studies of Job Satisfaction: V. Scale Characteristics of the Job Descriptive Index. Cornell University, ;1963. (mimeo)

was used with the trait receiving between an Unsatisfactory and an Outstanding rating. After a preliminary analysis of the data it was decided to retain seven specific traits and the overall rating as criteria measures for job performance. These seven traits were:

> Communication skills, ability in oral, written, and mechanical.
> Quality of work, ability to meet quality demands.
> Quantity of work, output of satisfactory work.
> Cooperativeness, ability to work together with people.
> Reaction to advice and constructive criticism.
> Dependability, thorough completion of a job without supervision.
> Attendance, reporting for work regularly.

Procedure

In preparing the data for analysis it was apparent the number of workers was not large enough to use the five-point scale on either the self ratings or the teacher ratings of the student. Therefore the five categories were collapsed to three--below average, average, and above average.

The job satisfaction instrument has five separate raw scores which could be treated as continuous but in order to reduce the number of cells it was decided to change these continuous job satisfaction scores into a dichotomy between high and low scores on each of the five categories. The highest possible score in three categories was 18 and in the other two categories it was nine. High satisfaction in the first three categories became scores of ten or above and low satisfaction scores were nine or below. In the two categories with nine scores, high satisfaction became scores of six and above and low satisfaction scores were five and below.

In analyzing the job performance ratings it was necessary to collapse the five categories to two in the case of boys. This was accomplished by grouping the outstanding, above average, and average supervisor ratings into a "satisfactory" category. In the case of girls there was

a sufficient number to retain three categories. In this instance the outstanding and above average were combined into an above average category, the average ratings were retained, and the below average and unsatisfactory ratings were combined into a below average category.

The number of boys and girls with satisfied and dissatisfied job satisfaction ratings by category is as follows:

Satisfaction Dimensions	Boys		Girls	
	Satisfied N	Dissatisfied N	Satisfied N	Dissatisfied N
Co-workers	7	38	20	122
Supervision	5	40	10	132
Work itself	15	30	30	112
Promotion	18	27	74	68
Pay	17	28	40	102

The number of boys receiving satisfactory and unsatisfactory performance ratings by category is as follows:

Performance Dimensions	Boys	
	Satisfactory N	Unsatisfactory N
Communication Skills	29	5
Work Quality	29	5
Work Quantity	28	6
Work with People	30	4
Dependability	29	5
Attendance	32	2
Reaction to Supervision	28	6
Overall Ratings	31	3

The number of girls receiving above average, average, and below average performance ratings by category is as follows:

Performance Dimensions	Girls Above Average N	Average N	Below Average N
Communication Skills	35	54	14
Work Quality	59	38	6
Work Quantity	54	41	8
Work with People	67	32	4
Dependability	63	29	11
Attendance	64	28	11
Reaction to Supervision	49	45	9
Overall Rating	57	41	5

Results and Discussion

The results will be used to answer the four questions:

1. What differentiates between the boys and girls who continue their education and those who enter work after graduation from high school?

2. What psycho-social-scholastic characteristics of high school senior boys are related to job satisfaction and satisfactory job performance two years after graduation?

3. What psycho-social-scholastic characteristics of high school senior girls are related to job satisfaction and satisfactory job performance two years after graduation?

4. How are the measures of job satisfaction and job performance intra- and inter-related?

The statistical relationships of all the predictor variables with the five job satisfaction measures and the eight supervisor performance

ratings with one another were determined. Only the statistically significant and near-significant findings are reported and commented upon.

The level of statistical significance is noted with a double asterisk (**) for the .01 level, a single asterisk (*) for the .05 level, and no asterisk, just the chi square, for near-significant findings. The reason near-significant findings are reported is that this is largely an exploratory study with relatively small numbers and it is important to retain for further study any variable which may prove useful in counseling students in secondary school vocational programs.

A summary of responses to other questions on the follow up instrument is reported at the end of the tabular results.

TABLE 1

Predictor Variables Which Distinguish Between the Boys Who Entered Work and the Boys Who Continued Their Education

Variables	df	Chi Square	Discussion
Community size	3	18.49**	Boys were more apt to go to work if from a large metropolitan area or rural community. Those from smaller cities were more likely to continue their training.
Teacher ratings of:			
Industriousness	2	4.29	Students rated below average in personal appearance were more likely to enter work. Students rated as below average in industriousness and in getting along with others tended to enter work. Students rated by their teachers as above average in all three areas were about evenly split between entering work and going to school
Personal appearance	2	7.97*	
Getting along with others	2	5.84	

TABLE 1 (cont.)

Variables	df	Chi Square	Discussion
Student self ratings of:			There was no relationship between how the students described themselves and whether they entered work or went to school.
Post high school plans	4	90.77**	All students who continued their schooling said they would. The majority, 57%, of those entering work said they would while the remainder thought they would continue their training.
Post high school training		54.61**	All those planning further schooling wanted technical training or college. One-third of those entering work had no plans, another third planned technical training, and only a few desired apprentice training or college.
Location of work	3	11.85**	Over half the workers wanted to remain within 100 miles of home. Two-thirds of the students were willing to work any place in the world.
Work value orientation	6	11.28	There was a tendency for those going to school to place more value on using their talents and skills while the workers tended to place more emphasis on getting a job where they would be on their own.
Life satisfactions	4	9.57*	The major difference was the workers' feeling that their family would provide more satisfaction.
Father's educational level	3	6.48	The father's educational level of those who continued their education tended to be higher.

TABLE 1 (cont.)

Variables	df	Chi Square	Discussion
Achievement test scores:			
Mathematics	4	20.40**	In mathematics, science, and writing achievement most workers scored low and most students scored high.
Science	4	11.85**	
Writing	4	11.42**	
Cumulative high school grades:			
Science	2	13.11**	Only if a boy did well in science was he likely to continue his education. Conversely boys who failed science were more likely not to continue their education. There was no consistent pattern for the C science student.

TABLE 2

Predictor Variables Which Distinguish Between the 186 Girls Who Entered Work and the 60 Girls Who Continued Their Education

Variables	df	Chi Square	Discussion
Community size	3	6.50	There was a tendency for girls from large metropolitan and rural areas to enter work and those from smaller cities to continue their training.
Post high school plans	3	179.77**	All the girls who continued their education said they would and 80% of those entering work stated this as a goal when a senior.
Post high school training	3	107.99**	All those planning school wanted technical training or college. Over half of those entering work had no plans and the remainder wanted technical training.

TABLE 2 (cont.)

Variables	df	Chi Square	Discussion
Location of work	3	16.88**	Two-thirds of the working girls would remain within 100 miles of home while half the students would be willing to work anywhere.
Salary aspiration	2	18.49**	The salary aspirations of those going to school were considerably higher than those working.
Relationship to work model	6	15.69*	A greater percentage of those working identified with someone in their family. Those going to school were more likely to identify with a non-relative on the job.
Father's educational level	3	6.74	Father's educational level of girls going to school tended to be higher.
Achievement test scores:			
Mathematics	4	12.72*	Girls in school had significantly higher mathematics achievement test scores and tended to have higher science achievement test scores than those working.
Science	4	9.12	

TABLE 3

Relationship of High School Predictors and
Satisfaction with Co-Worker Ratings of 45 Males

Variables	df	Chi Square	Discussion
Teacher ratings of: Leadership	2	5.76	There was a tendency for those who were more satisfied with their co-workers to have received higher leadership ratings from their teachers.
Work value orientation	6	13.36*	The more satisfied valued a job with little danger of being fired and where you could work with your friends. The majority of the dissatisfied had aspired for a job in which they could use their special skills and talents.
Father's education	3	4.93	There was a slight tendency for sons of college graduates to be more satisfied with their co-workers.

TABLE 4

Relationship of High School Predictors and
Satisfaction with Supervision Ratings of 45 Males

Variables	df	Chi Square	Discussion
Teacher ratings of: Leadership	2	4.89	Those who were more satisfied with their supervision were rated by their high school teachers as thorough. There is a tendency for those rated as leaders by their teachers to be more satisfied also.
Thoroughness	2	6.04*	
Location of work	2	3.89	There was a tendency for the satisfied to have limited themselves to working within a 25-mile radius of home.

TABLE 4 (cont.)

Variables	df	Chi Square	Discussion
Work value orientation	6	11.38	The satisfied were more likely to want jobs where they would be esteemed by others and where they could be on their own. The dissatisfied wanted a job in which they could use their special skills.

TABLE 5

Relationship of High School Predictors and Satisfaction with Present Work Ratings of 45 Males

Variables	df	Chi Square	Discussion
Teacher ratings of: Social Habits	2	5.07	There is a tendency for those who were dissatisfied with the duties on their present job to have been rated by their teachers as above average in social habits.
Student self ratings of: Leadership	2	4.14	The less satisfied tended to rate themselves in high schools as leaders.
Relationship to work model	3	4.93	There was a tendency for the dissatisfied to have identified with a worker who is a relative other than a parent.
Work value orientation	6	9.12	There was a tendency for the dissatisfied to value using their special skills more.
Cumulative high school grades:			The more satisfied tended to fail English and the less satisfied tended to do well in mathematics.
English	2	4.16	
Mathematics	2	5.17	

TABLE 6

Relationship of High School Predictors and
Satisfaction with Promotion Opportunities of 45 Males

Variables	df	Chi Square	Discussion
No significant or near-significant relationships.			

TABLE 7

Relationship of High School Predictors and
Satisfaction with Pay Ratings of 45 Males

Variables	df	Chi Square	Discussion
Teacher ratings of:			
Industriousness	2	6.80*	The satisfied males were described by their teachers as either very industrious or lazy by their teachers. The dissatisfied were described as fitting between these two extremes.
Student self ratings of:			
Industriousness	2	5.28	The less satisfied tended to describe themselves as above average on industriousness.
Work value orientation	6	9.74	There was a tendency for the less satisfied to want more of an opportunity to use their special skills on the job.

Supervisors' Performance Ratings of Boys

The job supervisor rated as unsatisfactory the communication skills of five boys, the work quality of five, the work quantity of six, the ability to get along with others of four, the dependability of five, the attendance of two, the reaction to directions of six, and three boys overall. It was not possible to apply any statistical analysis to these data but some general comments can be made regarding how the boys who were not performing adequately in these eight areas differed from the others.

The five rated as having unsatisfactory COMMUNICATION SKILLS were all rated below average by their teachers on mental alertness and thoroughness. They all rated themselves above average on dependability, personal appearance, ability to get along with others, and employability. They would go anywhere in the world for work. They all had cumulative-grade-point averages of F in English and all their fathers had ended their schooling prior to high school.

All five evidencing unsatisfactory WORK QUALITY were rated by their teachers as below average on dependability and industriousness. They rated themselves above average on cultural refinement and employability. Father's education was less than a high school graduate and they were all below the 40th percentile in reading, social studies, and writing achievement test scores.

The six rated as having unsatisfactory WORK QUANTITY were rated below average by their teachers on dependability and mental alertness. They rated themselves above average on cultural refinement and employability. All six scored below the 40th percentile in reading and writing achievement and below the 19th percentile in science. They all had salary aspirations of $150 a week or more.

The four judged as having difficulty with their CO-WORKERS were rated as undependable by their teachers. Their fathers had less than a high school education and all their fathers had unskilled jobs. They had failed all their English and mathematics courses.

The five boys rated UNDEPENDABLE aspired for over $150 a week income and described themselves above average in cultural refinement, mental ability, personal appearance, ability to get along with others, and employability. Their fathers' education was less than high school. Their reading, social studies, and writing achievement test scores were below the 40th percentile. They had received F's in their social studies and mathematics courses and averaged B in industrial arts.

The two boys who failed to SHOW UP FOR WORK regularly had nothing in common except they had done C work in high school.

The six who were rated as responding poorly to ADVICE AND CONSTRUCTIVE CRITICISM were desirous of making $150 or more a week. They felt their family would provide them the most satisfaction in life. They generally scored higher than others in mathematics and science achievement tests and scored generally lower on the writing achievement test. They had not received satisfactory grades in their high school mathematics courses but had done exceptionally well in industrial arts.

The three boys with unsatisfactory OVERALL ratings described themselves as above average on cultural refinement, personal appearance, in their ability to get along with others, and their social habits. They had failed all their high school mathematics courses.

TABLE 8

Relationship of High School Predictors and
Satisfaction with Co-Worker Ratings of 142 Females

Variables	df	Chi Square	Discussion
Work value orientation	6	12.89*	The highly satisfied girls preferred jobs where they could work on their own and the dissatisfied wanted an opportunity to use their special skills.
Fathers' education	3	8.94*	A greater percentage of the satisfied girls had fathers graduated from high school. The dissatisfied had more fathers with only elementary school educations.
Cumulative high school grades:			
Social Studies	1	5.82*	A greater percentage of the dissatisfied failed all their science courses.

TABLE 9

Relationship of High School Predictors and
Satisfaction with Supervision Ratings of 142 Females

Variables	df	Chi Square	Discussion
Teacher ratings of:			
Dependability	2	8.85*	Most of the less satisfied girls were rated by their teachers above average on dependability, industriousness, mental alertness, thoroughness, appearance and social habits. The more satisfied girls were rated average on all these dimensions by their teachers. The dissatisfied girls were rated below average on cultural refinement by their teachers.
Cultural refinement	1	6.61*	
Industriousness	2	6.02*	
Mental alertness	2	7.02*	
Thoroughness	2	6.03*	
Personal appearance	2	7.31*	
Social habits	2	6.75*	

TABLE 9 (cont.)

Variables	df	Chi Square	Discussion
Student self ratings of:			
Dependability	2	16.43*	The more satisfied rated themselves in high school as not being thorough. Most of the satisfied girls felt their chances of obtaining employment were excellent. All the girls who had rated themselves below average on dependability were satisfied with their supervision whereas 5 out of 6 girls who rated themselves average on dependability were satisfied with their supervision.
Thoroughness	2	6.53*	
Employability	2	12.13**	
Relationship to work model	3	7.82*	The satisfied girls identified with a relative other than parent while the dissatisfied identified more with a friend or acquaintance.

TABLE 10

Relationship of High School Predictors and Satisfaction with Present Work Ratings of 142 Females

Variables	df	Chi Square	Discussion
Teacher ratings of:			
Dependability	2	6.55*	The satisfied girls had been rated by their teachers as less dependable, less refined, as followers rather than leaders, as having poorer general appearance, as less able to get along with others, and as having poorer social habits.
Cultural refinement	1	7.80**	
Leadership	2	6.28*	
Personal appearance	2	10.15**	
Getting along with others	2	8.90*	
Social habits	2	9.15*	

TABLE 10 (cont.)

Student self ratings of:			Satisfied girls rated themselves lower than dissatisfied girls on leadership, thoroughness, and social habits. The satisfied girls also tended to rate their mental alertness lower.
Leadership	2	7.34*	
Mental alertness	2	5.64	
Thoroughness	2	16.96**	
Social habits	2	9.19*	
Work value orientation	6	13.15*	The less satisfied desired a job where they could use their special abilities. Most of the satisfied girls sought a job where they would not be fired.
Fathers' education	3	7.53	The fathers of dissatisfied girls tended to have more education.
Cumulative high school grades:			
Business	2	5.18	The less satisfied girls tended to get better grades in business courses.

TABLE 11

Relationship of High School Predictors and Satisfaction with Promotion Opportunities Ratings of 142 Females

Variables	df	Chi Square	Discussion
Student self ratings of:			
Personal appearance	2	4.97	The dissatisfied girls tended to rate their personal appearance higher than the satisfied girls. The dissatisfied girls had rated their ability to get along with others higher than the satisfied girls.
Getting along with others	2	7.03*	
Relationship to work model	3	8.09*	The less satisfied identified more with a member of the family other than their parents and the satisfied identified with a friend or acquaintance on the job.

TABLE 12

Relationship of High School Predictors and
Satisfaction with Pay Ratings of 142 Females

Variables	df	Chi Square	Discussion
Relationship to work model	3	8.71*	The less satisfied identifed with a member of the family other than parents. The satisfied identified more with a friend or acquantance on the job.

TABLE 13

Relationship of High School Predictors for 103 Females with Communication Skill Ratings by their Work Supervisor

Variables	df	Chi Square	Discussion
Quartile	2	6.91*	Girls ranked in the top quarter in high school by their teachers were more likely to be rated above average in communication skills by their supervisors.
Student self ratings of: Getting along with others	4	11.35*	Those with above average and average self ratings of their ability to get along with others appeared to communicate better on the job than girls who rated themselves below average in getting along with others.

TABLE 14

Relationship of High School Predictors for 103 Females with Work Quality Ratings by Their Work Supervisors

Variables	df	Chi Square	Discussion
Quartile	2	5.82	Girls rated as doing above average quality in their work tended to be rated by their teachers as being in the top quarter on the dimension of projected on-the-job performance.
Student self ratings of: Employability	4	10.68*	Those who described themselves as highly capable of obtaining employment received above average quality ratings while those who were uncertain about their chances of obtaining employment received average ratings on their work quality.

TABLE 14 (cont.)

Variables	df	Chi Square	Discussion
Fathers' occupational level	8	17.88*	Girls doing above average work quality were more likely to have fathers in the skilled occupation and above; while those doing poor quality work had more fathers employed in semi-skilled and unskilled jobs.
Cumulative high school grades			
English	4	12.06*	Girls doing good quality work had higher English and science grades than those doing average quality work.
Science	4	12.94*	

TABLE 15

Relationship of High School Predictors for 103 Females with Work Quantity Ratings by Their Work Supervisors

Variables	df	Chi Square	Discussion
Cumulative high school grades:			
English	4	10.37*	Girls with either A's or F's in English and Science were more likely to receive high work quantity ratings; whereas girls with C grades received average ratings for work quantity.
Science	4	9.48	

TABLE 16

Relationship of High School Predictors for 103 Females with Getting Along with Co-Worker Ratings by their Work Supervisors

Variables	df	Chi Square	Discussion
Teacher ratings of:			
Dependability	4	13.43*	Girls rated above average by their teachers on dependability and in getting along with others were more likely to get along better with their co-workers.
Getting along with others	4	12.36*	
Student self ratings of:			
Social habits	4	19.54**	Students rating their social habits as average and rating themselves above average in their chances of obtaining employment got along better with their co-workers than did girls who rated their social habits above average and their employability as average.
Employability	4	16.49**	

TABLE 17

Relationship of High School Predictors for 103 Females with Dependability Ratings by Their Work Supervisors

Variables	df	Chi Square	Discussion
Teacher ratings of:			
Social habits	4	16.37**	Girls rated below average in social habits received high dependability ratings. Girls rated above average in social habits received about an equal proportion of high, average, and low dependability ratings.
Student self ratings of:			
Leadership	4	9.50*	Girls rating themselves above average in leadership were more likely to receive unsatisfactory dependability ratings and girls who rated their leadership as average or below received higher ratings for dependability.

TABLE 17 (cont.)

Variables	df	Chi Square	Discussion
Relationship to work model	6	12.90*	Girls identifying with a relative were rated more dependable than girls who identified with a friend or acquaintance.
Cumulative high school grades:			
Science	4	13.97*	Girls who achieved A and B averages in science were either rated as highly dependable or very undependable. Girls achieving a C average were rated as average on dependability. Most girls who failed science were rated above average.

TABLE 18

Relationship of High School Predictors for 103 Females with Attendance Ratings by their Work Supervisors

Variables	df	Chi Square	Discussion
Teacher ratings of:			
Dependability	4	12.25*	Girls rated highly dependable by their teachers had better attendance records.
Student self ratings of:			
Industriousness	4	9.63*	Girls rating themselves average or below on industriousness had poor attendance than those who rated themselves above average.
Social habits	4	9.60*	Girls who rated their social habits either above or below average had poorer attendance than those who rated themselves average.

TABLE 18 (cont.)

Variables	df	Chi Square	Discussion
Work value orientation	12	32.08*	Girls with average or above average attendance were more likely to want a job where they could use their talents or skills whereas those with unsatisfactory attendance were more desirous of a job where they had little chance of being fired.
Cumulative high school grades:			
English	4	9.60*	Girls who passed English had better attendance than girls who failed.
Mathematics	4	9.60*	Girls with either above or below average attendance were likely to have failed mathematics and those with average attendance were likely to have passed mathematics.

TABLE 19

Relationship of High School Predictors for 103 Females with Reaction to Supervision Ratings Made by Their Work Supervisors

Variables	df	Chi Square	Discussion
Life satisfactions	8	16.39*	Most girls cited the family as the chief source of their life satisfaction. However, girls who felt work would be the major source of satisfaction were more likely to receive higher ratings.

TABLE 20

Relationship of High School Predictors for 103 Females with Overall Performance Ratings Made by Their Work Supervisors

Variables	df	Chi Square	Discussion
Quartile	2	5.32	There was a tendency for girls rated in the upper quartile to receive above average overall ratings and girls in the bottom quarter to receive average overall ratings.
Student self ratings of:			
Industriousness	4	12.38*	Those who rated their industriousness above average received either above or below overall ratings. Those who rated their industriousness average were more likely to receive average overall ratings.
Cumulative high school grades:			
Science	4	11.24*	Girls with failing science averages received average and above average overall ratings whereas the few girls with poor overall ratings had all passed science.

TABLE 21

Comparison of Five Satisfaction Scores
with One Another for 45 Males

Satisfaction Variables	df	Chi Square	Discussion
Present work with pay	1	8.31*	The only statistically significant relationship was that males dissatisfied with the work itself were also dissatisfied with promotion opportunities. Those satisfied with one were not necessarily satisfied with the other.
Promotion with Pay	1	3.83	Although not statistically significant there was a tendency for boys to be either satisfied or dissatisfied with both pay and promotion.

TABLE 22

Comparison of Five Satisfaction Scores
with One Another for 142 Females

Satisfaction Variables	df	Chi Square	Discussion
Co-workers with supervision	1	4.64*	Girls who were dissatisfied with their co-workers were dissatisfied with both their supervisor and the work itself.
with present work	1	4.00*	
Present work with pay	1	12.16**	The majority of girls dissatisfied with their work were dissatisfied with their pay. Those satisfied with one were not necessarily satisfied with the other.
Promotion with pay	1	10.79**	The majority of girls satisfied with pay were satisfied with promotion opportunities. A large number of those satisfied with promotion opportunities were dissatisfied with their pay.

Comparison of Eight Performance Ratings
with One Another for 34 Males

So few boys were rated below average on any of the performance criteria that a comparative analysis was not meaningful.

TABLE 23

Comparison of Eight Performance Ratings
with One Another for 103 Females

Performance Variables	df	Chi Square	Discussion
Communication skills			
with quality	1	5.89*	Girls rated high on one performance variable were rated high on nearly all other variables. The same girls were likely to receive low ratings on communication skills, work quality, work quantity, ability to get along with others, and overall. About half the girls receiving low ratings on dependability and attendance received low ratings on the other variables but the other half received average or high ratings.
with quantity	1	8.08*	
with people	1	11.38**	
with dependability	1	5.22*	
with reaction to supervision	1	8.06**	
with overall	1	8.06**	
Work quality			
with quantity	1	40.86**	
with people	1	11.63**	
with dependability	1	18.48**	
with attendance	1	21.15**	
with reaction to supervision	1	12.29**	
with overall	1	42.44**	
Work quantity			
with people	1	20.92**	
with dependability	1	21.48**	
with attendance	1	24.41**	
with reaction to supervision	1	7.75**	
with overall	1	33.44**	

TABLE 23 (cont.)

Performance Variables	df	Chi Square	Discussion
Work with people			
with dependability	1	15.79**	
with attendance	1	6.53*	
with reaction to supervision	1	7.48**	
with overall	1	17.77**	
Dependability			
with reaction to supervision	1	11.93**	
with overall	1	25.22**	
Attendance			
with reaction to supervision	1	13.88**	
with overall	1	14.71**	
Reaction to supervision			
with overall	1	29.35**	

TABLE 24

Comparison of 34 Males Satisfaction Ratings with Their Supervisors' Performance Ratings

Satisfaction vs Performance	df	Chi Square	Discussion
Pay			
with work quality	1	3.37	All five boys whose work quality and dependability were rated unsatisfactory were dissatisfied with their pay.
with dependability	1	4.19*	
Promotion			
with communication skills		4.57*	All four boys whose communication skills were rated unsatisfactory were satisifed with promotional opportunities while half of the boys with satisfactory communication skills were dissatisfied with their promotional' opportunities.

TABLE 24 (cont.)

Satisfaction vs Performance	df	Chi Square	Discussion
Co-workers			
with work quality	1	5.31*	Nearly all boys rated above average in work quality, quantity, getting along with others, and overall were dissatisfied with their co-workers. About half those rated below average in these four areas were dissatisfied with their co-workers.
with getting along with others	1	12.26**	
with overall	1	4.08*	

TABLE 25

Comparison of 103 Females Satisfaction Ratings with Their Supervisors' Performance Ratings

Satisfaction vs Performance	df	Chi Square	Discussion
Pay			
with communication skills	1	3.98*	The less satisfied girls were with pay the more likely they were to receive high ratings in communication skills, work quality and quantity. The girls who reacted better to supervision were more likely to be dissatisfied with pay; those who reacted poorly more likely to be satisfied with their pay.
with work quality	1	5.36*	
with work quantity	1	5.89*	
with reaction to supervision	1	5.89*	
Job duties			
with work quality	1	7.16*	Girls dissatisfied with their job duties did higher quality work and satisfied girls did poorer quality work. The same relationship tended to be true for work quantity.
with work quantity	1	3.79	
with attendance	1	6.17*	The dissatisfied girls had better attendance records and tended to react better to directions than did the satisfied girls
with reaction to supervision	1	3.79	

TABLE 25 (cont.)

Satisfaction vs Performance	df	Chi Square	Discussion
Supervision			
with work quality	1	14.68**	Nearly all girls rated above average on work quality, quantity, attendance, and overall were dissatisfied with their supervisor. Only half those below average in these four areas were dissatisfied with their supervisor.
with work quantity	1	20.09**	
with attendance	1	17.21**	
with overall	1	18.58**	

RESPONSES TO OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

Why did you choose the job you now have?

Reasons	Girls	Boys
Supervisor	2	2
People	15	2
Pay	34	16
Promotion	6	7
Work itself	98	21

If you have changed jobs, why did you leave your previous job?

Reasons	Girls	Boys
Supervisor	1	
People	2	
Pay	12	16
Promotion	10	2
Work itself	35	8

If you plan to change jobs in next three years, give reasons.

Reasons	Girls	Boys
Better pay	9	6
Marriage-pregnancy	9	
Work itself--boring, etc.	18	1
Moving	11	1
Completed a training program	1	
Going back to school	6	2
Joining the armed forces		5
Better chance of advancement	6	5
To better self	2	
Want a more stable job	1	
Variety		1
Job offered to me	1	

How is a work day similar to a day in school?

Responses	Girls	Boys
Constantly learning	25	9
Supervised, do as boss says get work done on time	24	3
Work day same (hours)	48	8
Certain routine	6	4
Performance must be good	4	1
Both are compulsory	1	
Meet many kinds of people	4	
Exactly like training	9	1
Have rules to follow	1	
No comparison	20	14

In what way is a work day different from a day in school?

Responses	Girls	Boys
More thinking involved, challenge	4	3
More independence, less authority	48	12
Longer day	5	
Paid	13	14
More responsibility	18	3
More enjoyable	4	2
Not moving from class to class	1	
No homework	17	
Physical instead of mental work	1	6
Doing one king of thing	5	1
Must keep busy, less goofing off	4	
Relation to people	2	2
Every way	3	2
Have to have clean uniform every day	1	
Different hours	2	1
More variety	6	1
No comparison	2	2

Why did you choose work rather than schooling after you graduated?

Responses	Girls	Boys
Wanted and liked to work	16	2
Plan to be or got married	16	2
Needed money, wanted to be on own, earn a living	28	7
School did not interest me, college not useful	37	10
Did not feel I needed more	20	4
Could not go to college (grades)	5	5
Could not go to college (money)	25	8
Want to work until drafted		1

Why did you choose work rather than schooling after you graduated? (cont.)

Responses	Girls	Boys
Wanted the experience	2	1
Was not sure of a career	1	4
Personal problems, family difficulties	1	1
Wanted to get out and meet people	2	
Know I would not finish college	1	1
I would have trouble with courses	2	1
Did not take preparatory courses in high school	3	
No classes in my field at Eau Claire		1
School does not offer kind of course		2
Went to vocational school instead	1	
Advice of guidance counselor	1	
Had feeling of being pushed to go, so did not		1
I had no choice in the matter	1	
Planned to get further training in service		1

Conclusions

Keeping in mind the results of this study are influenced by the circumstances which existed in 1966, it appears the following variables distinguished boys and girls who entered work directly.

1. Living in either a rural or metropolitan area.
2. Wanting to remain near home.
3. Having fathers with an elementary school education.
4. Having poor mathematics and science achievement.

Boys who entered work were also rated poor by their teachers in personal appearance, industriousness, and getting along with others. Girls entering work directly were likely to identify with their mothers or a female relative.

It is necessary to consider job satisfaction as consisting of five relatively discrete dimensions with different predictor variables related to each. Job performance tends to be a more general concept and the eight "so-called dimensions" used in this study are not very independent of one another.

Somehat surprisingly job satisfaction and job performance tend to be inversely related, particularly for girls. This might be explained in part if these graduates feel they are still in the trial-and-error stage of vocational selection.

Most of the results are self explanatory and do not require further discussion. Due to the small number of boys involved it is hard to interpret the significance of these findings.

Appendix A

STUDENT DESCRIPTION

You are asked to rate yourself (or a student) on each of the qualities below. Place an "X" in the Column that best describes you (him).

	POOR	BELOW AVERAGE	AVERAGE	ABOVE AVERAGE	SUPERIOR
DEPENDABILITY: prompt, sincere, truthful, consistent					
REFINEMENT: courteous, good manners, considerate					
LEADERSHIP: able to inspire others to act, forceful					
HARD WORKING: make wise use of your time, persistent					
MENTAL ALERTNESS: attentive, eager to learn, interested					
THOROUGHNESS: accurate, complete my work, careful, stay interested					
PERSONAL APPEARANCE AND GROOMING: clean, neat, poised					
ABILITY TO GET ALONG WITH OTHERS: cooperative, friendly, enjoy being with others					
SOCIAL HABITS: self control, seldom argue or complain, seldom make excuses					

	NO	MAYBE	YES
EMPLOYABILITY: get and keep a job, if you were hiring you would want someone like yourself			

WORK ATTITUDE SURVEY

1) Think of the pay you get now.
2) Think of the opportunities for promotion you have now.

With these in mind, how well does each of the following words describe them? In the blank beside each word put

__y__ if it describes your pay or your opportunities for promotion
__n__ if it does NOT describe it
__?__ if you cannot decide

. . . . . .

PRESENT PAY

____Income adequate for normal expenses

____Satisfactory profit sharing

____Barely live on income

____Bad

____Income provides luxuries

____Less than I deserve

____Highly paid

____Underpaid

OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROMOTION

____Good opportunities for promotion

____Opportunity somewhat limited

____Promotion on ability

____Dead-end job

____Good chance for promotion

____Unfair promotion policy

____Infrequent promotions

____Regular promotions

____Fairly good chance for promotion

Think of your present work. What is it like most of the time? In the blank beside each word given below, write

__y__ for "yes" if it describes your work
__n__ for "no" if it does NOT describe it
__?__ if you cannot decide

. . . . . .

WORK ON PRESENT JOB

____Fascinating

____Routine

____Satisfying

____Boring

____Good

____Creative

____Respected

____Hot

____Pleasant

____Useful

____Tiresome

____Healthful

____Challenging

____On your feet

____Frustrating

____Simple

____Endless

____Give sense of accomplishment

OVER

Think of the kind of supervision that you get on your job. How well does each of the following words describe this supervision? In the blank beside each word below, put

__Y__ if it describes the supervision you get on your job
__n__ if it does NOT describe it
__?__ if you cannot decide

. . . . . .

SUPERVISION ON PRESENT JOB

____Asks my advice

____Hard to please

____Impolite

____Praises good work

____Tactful

____Influential

____Up-to-date

____Doesn't supervise enough

____Quick tempered

____Tells me where I stand

____Annoying

____Stubborn

____Knows job well

____Bad

____Intelligent

____Leaves me on my own

____Around when needed

____Lazy

Think of the majority of the people that you work with now or the people you meet in connection with your work. How well does each of the following words describe these people? In the blank beside each word below, put

__y__ if it describes the people you work with
__n__ if it does NOT describe them
__?__ if you cannot decide

. . . . . .

PEOPLE ON YOUR PRESENT JOB

____Stimulating

____Boring

____Slow

____Ambitious

____Stupid

____Responsible

____Fast

____Intelligent

____Easy to make enemies

____Talk too much

____Smart

____Lazy

____Unpleasant

____No privacy

____Active

____Narrow interests

____Loyal

____Hard to meet

Appendix C

SUPERVISOR'S RATING SCALE

To be completed by the immediate supervisor of _____

Use these scales to rate the job performance and personal characteristics of the employee listed above. Please be honest. No one connected with your organization will ever see these individual ratings. They will be used by the worker's high school, The University of Wisconsin, and The State Department of Public Instruction to determine how well high schools are training students for employment. When you have completed these forms, seal them in the envelope attached and return them. The person you are rating has given us permission to contact you.

This scale lists four general areas of work performance. Under each general area there are descriptions of certain worker traits. Rate the employee listed above by circling the letter that best describes this employee on this trait.

U = Unsatisfactory
BA = Below Average
A = Average
AA = Above Average
O = Outstanding

If a trait does not describe this employee's job, circle NA for Not Applicable.

AREA A. OCCUPATIONAL KNOWLEDGE

1. Technical knowledge and understanding shown in work	U	BA	A	AA	O	NA
2. Understanding of mathematics related to work	U	BA	A	AA	O	NA
3. Understanding of sciences related to work	U	BA	A	AA	O	NA
4. Communication skills, ability in oral, written, and mechanical techniques of communicating	U	BA	A	AA	O	NA

AREA B. MANIPULATIVE SKILLS

1. Quality of work, ability to meet quality standards	U	BA	A	AA	O	NA
2. Quantity of work, output of satisfactory work	U	BA	A	AA	O	NA
3. Job know how application of acquired knowledge and skills	U	BA	A	AA	O	NA
4. Proper use of tools and equipment	U	BA	A	AA	O	NA
5. Correct selection and care of materials and supplies	U	BA	A	AA	O	NA

(Please turn to next page)

U = Unsatisfactory
BA = Below Average
A = Average
AA = Above Average
O = Outstanding

AREA C. PERSONAL AND SOCIAL QUALITIES

1. Cooperativeness, ability to work together with people	U	BA	A	AA	O	NA
2. Self-control, ability to control one's emotions	U	BA	A	AA	O	NA
3. Reaction to advice and constructive criticism	U	BA	A	AA	O	NA
4. Adaptability, capacity to adjust to new problems and changing situations	U	BA	A	AA	O	NA

AREA D: WORK QUALITIES AND HABITS

1. Industry, personal application to work assigned	U	BA	A	AA	O	NA
2. Dependability, thorough completion of a job without supervision	U	BA	A	AA	O	NA
3. Safety habits, minimizing chances for accident	U	BA	A	AA	O	NA
4. Attendance, reporting for work regularly	U	BA	A	AA	O	NA
5. Punctuality, reporting for work on time	U	BA	A	AA	O	NA

SUMMATION:

1. Rate the employee's overall performance on this job	U	BA	A	AA	O	NA

Rated by _____ Position _____
(Name)

Organization _____

Address _____
(Street)

_____
(City)

Date Rating Completed _____